

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SCOTT N. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-2019 KJM-GGH

vs.

LACK FAMILY INVESTMENTS, LP,

Defendant.

---

SCOTT N. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-11-0003 KJM-GGH

vs.

LACK FAMILY INVESTMENTS, LP,

Defendant.

---

SCOTT N. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-11-0897 JAM-JFM

vs.

LACK FAMILY INVESTMENTS, LP,

Defendant.

---

RELATED CASE ORDER

1 Examination of the above-captioned actions reveals that they are related within  
2 the meaning of Local Rule 123(a). All three actions involve the same parties and similar  
3 questions of fact. Accordingly, the assignment of these matters to the same judge is likely to  
4 effect a substantial savings of judicial effort and is likely to be convenient for the parties.


5 The parties should be aware that relating cases under Rule 123 causes the actions  
6 to be assigned to the same judge – it does not consolidate the actions. Under Rule 123, related  
7 cases are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was  
8 assigned.

9 As a result, it is hereby ORDERED that CIV S-11-0897 JAM-JFM, is reassigned  
10 from Judge Mendez to the undersigned and from Magistrate Judge Moulds to Magistrate Judge  
11 Hollows. Henceforth, the caption on documents filed in the reassigned case shall be shown as:  
12 CIV S-11-0897 KJM-GGH.

13 It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court make appropriate adjustment  
14 in the assignment of civil cases to compensate for this reassignment.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: May 10, 2011.

17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26